

# **Exhibit A**

5-24-18-MD 15-2641-Jones v Bard-Jury Trial-Day 7-Grassi-Cross

1 A. No. I would say that the establishment of the guidelines  
2 was not limited to doctors or physicians alone in the same way  
3 it wasn't limited to interventional radiologists. Anyone who  
4 would be placing an IVC filter, working with patients with IVC  
5 filters, in fairness could read and benefit from the  
6 information contained in the guidelines.

02:55PM

7 Q. Let's see if we can agree on something. You would agree  
8 that the guidelines are not meant to establish a standard of  
9 care for physicians using IVC filters. Is that right?

02:55PM

10 A. They are meant to be educational.

11 Q. In other words not the standard of care. It's educational.  
12 It's information?

13 A. They certainly are guidelines, that's right, and a summary  
14 for physicians and those working with filters.

15 Q. And it's not meant to establish a standard of care for  
16 medical device companies who may be working with IVC filters,  
17 right? That's not its design?

02:55PM

18 A. Well, it's not for me to comment on what a company would or  
19 would not use as a standard. I can only say that as one  
20 involved in the guidelines our goal was to be informative,  
21 educational, and be helpful with the summary.

02:56PM

22 Q. But would you agree with the statement that SIR guidelines  
23 do not create safety thresholds for filters that relate to  
24 perforation, fracture, migration, tilt, or the inability to  
25 remove a filter?

02:56PM

5-24-18-MD 15-2641-Jones v Bard-Jury Trial-Day 7-Grassi-Cross

1 A. Overall, I would.

2 Q. And that the SIR guidelines are not meant to be an  
3 instruction manual for medical device companies like Bard when  
4 they are designing a filter?

5 A. Certainly the guidelines were, as I think I have just  
6 described, any instruction manual or directives to the company  
7 would, of course, come from engineers and their own staff.

02:56PM

8 MR. CLARK: Gay, could you pull up Exhibit 6842.

9 Your Honor, in light of the Court's prior ruling  
10 concerning the SIR guidelines and their admissibility, I would  
11 move to admit 6842 into evidence.

02:57PM

12 THE COURT: What is it?

13 MR. CLARK: It is the update to the SIR guidelines.

14 THE COURT: The 2017?

15 MR. CLARK: Correct.

02:57PM

16 THE COURT: Any objection to having it admitted on the  
17 same basis?

18 MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I do object. We admitted it  
19 for the purpose of the knowledge of the medical community in  
20 2001 prior to the introduction of the Eclipse Filter. And as  
21 you just pointed out this was published in 2017.

02:57PM

22 THE COURT: Your response?

23 MR. CLARK: I was actually listening very carefully.

24 I think Mr. Rogers established the same foundation that he laid  
25 for that in that this was published. It was disseminated to

02:57PM